

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant gratefully acknowledges a telephone interview with Examiner Callahan on November 16, 2004. By examiner's amendment, the examiner entered correction of errors in wording of the specification. A review of the claims showed that the present claims appears to incorporate patentable subject matter.

#### **Claims Pending**

Claims 39-44 are pending in this application. Claims 1 -38 are canceled without prejudice. Claims 39-42 and 44 are independent. Claim 43 depends from claim 42. The number of type of claims is within those paid for by the original filing fee.

#### **Claims Allowable**

In the pending Office Action, claims 8 and 22 were indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form, which is now done:

Claim 40 presents the subject matter of former claim 8 in independent form.

Claim 42 presents the subject matter of former claim 22 in independent form.

#### **Claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph**

The pending Office Action says claims 7, 9 and 23-25 are allowable if rewritten to overcome rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. However, at page 2, last complete paragraph, the Office Action stated that the prior amendment made sufficient changes to overcome rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The Office Action states no new grounds for rejecting these claims. Therefore, it appears claims 7, 9 and 23-25 should be allowable if rewritten in independent form. The subject matter of Claims 7, 9, and 24-25 is addressed as follows:

Claim 39 presents the subject matter of former claim 7 in independent form.

Claim 41 presents the subject matter of former claim 9 in independent form.

Claim 43 presents the subject matter of former claim 24, now dependent from claim 42.

Claim 44 presents the subject matter of former claim 25 in independent form.

The subject matter of Claim 23 is reserved without prejudice.

#### **Reply to Advisory Action Dated 01/04/2005**

In the Advisory Action wherein the examiner refused to enter a prior amendment dated Nov. 16, 2004, the examiner objected that a limitation of Claim 5 had not been incorporated into new Claims 39-42. The purportedly omitted feature


was that that session keys are those *of the first sequence*. Claims 39-42 of this amendment are modified from the prior (non-entered) version to add reference at line 11 of each that the session keys are "of the first sequence." This addition is at the exact point referenced in the examiner's objection. The additional language appears to make little substantive difference as compared to the previously submitted version, in view of the fact that the present version and the previously submitted version already incorporated the noted limitation from Claim 5 at lines 19-21 of each. Nonetheless, the added language apparently resolves an issue of allowability of present Claims 39-42 and advances the case. The Advisory Action makes no other objection to these claims. Hence, they are believed to be allowable.

Present Claims 43-44 (in the prior, non-entered version, these were Claims 44-45) received no objection in the Advisory Action. They are believed to be allowable.

#### Conclusion

This amendment places the claims in better condition for allowance or appeal. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Kyle W. Rost, Reg. No. 27943  
Attorney for Applicant

5490 S. Autumn Court  
Greenwood Village, CO 80111-3417  
Telephone 720-528-8863  
Facsimile 720-528-8864  
Email [rost@usa.net](mailto:rost@usa.net)